

CERN-TH/97-314

BA-97-49

hep-ph/9711288

Minimal Supersymmetric $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ S. F. King^{† 1} and Q. Shafi^{*}[†] *Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*^{*} *Bartol Research Institute, University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716, USA***Abstract**

We present a minimal string-inspired supersymmetric $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ model, and provide a detailed analysis of the symmetry breaking potential in this model, based on a generalisation of that recently proposed by Dvali, Lazarides and Shafi. The model contains a global $U(1)$ R-symmetry and reduces to the MSSM at low energies. However it improves on the MSSM since it explains the magnitude of its μ term and gives a prediction for $\tan \beta \simeq m_t/m_b$. It also predicts an essentially stable proton, and contains both ‘cold’ and ‘hot’ dark matter candidates. A period of hybrid inflation above the symmetry breaking scale is also possible in this model. Finally it suggests the existence of ‘heavy’ charge $\pm e/6$ (colored) and $\pm e/2$ (color singlet) states.

CERN-TH/97-314

February 1, 2008

¹On leave of absence from Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, U.K.

In a recent paper by Dvali, Lazarides and Shafi (DLS) [1], the electroweak sector of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) was embedded in the supersymmetric gauge group $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$.² By imposing a global R-symmetry, $U(1)_R$, which also happens to contain the unbroken MSSM R-parity as a Z_2 subgroup, it was shown in [1] that the ‘low energy’ limit of this extension gives rise to a number of interesting consequences. For instance, one could relate the magnitude of the supersymmetric μ -term of MSSM to the supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking scale ($m_{3/2}$), and also automatically generate the $B\mu$ term. The apparent stability of the proton ($\tau_p > 10^{32} - 10^{33}$ yrs), which is somewhat challenging for MSSM since dimension five proton decay is in principle allowed, is explained to be a consequence of an accidental global $U(1)_B$ symmetry of the underlying superpotential. Finally, as one would expect, the extended gauge symmetry gives rise to non-zero neutrino masses which may play a role in the solar neutrino puzzle, dark matter issues, and so on.

In this note we extend the DLS approach to the Pati-Salam gauge group [2]

$$G_{PS} \equiv SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \quad (1)$$

Although the generalisation is essentially straightforward, we consider such an extension worthwhile for two reasons. The first is that G_{PS} can arise from certain four dimensional superstring constructions, which makes it an attractive candidate for the effective theory below the string scale [3]. The second reason is that although there has been a good deal of attention focussed on such a string-inspired model [4] there has been very little detailed discussion of the symmetry breaking mechanism which must be present in this model. In fact we are unaware of any analysis of the symmetry breaking potential of the string-inspired version of this model in which only Higgs in fundamental representations are permitted. The DLS mechanism will be shown to

²Original references to this gauge group, which is not our main concern here, may be found in [1].

be ideally suited for this purpose, and may be extended in a completely trivial way to the higher gauge symmetry. Apart from breaking the gauge symmetry correctly, the DLS mechanism also solves the μ problem, and provides a mechanism for hybrid inflation.

The resulting scheme may be regarded as minimal in the sense that the higgs sector contains the minimum number of fields needed to implement the gauge symmetry breaking. As in [1], the model may be supplemented by a $U(1)_R$ symmetry which contains the MSSM Z_2 R-parity. We show how our approach leads to a more robust MSSM at low energies. Namely, why the magnitude of the μ -term is $\sim TeV$, why the lightest (CP even) scalar has not been seen at LEP II, and why/how the proton happens to be so stable. Moreover, since $\tan \beta \simeq m_t/m_b$, one is able to be quite a bit more specific about the sparticle spectrum, as well as the composition of the LSP (essentially a ‘bino’). Finally, the model contains both ‘cold’ and ‘hot’ dark matter candidates, which seems desirable from studies of large scale structure formation [5].

It has been realised for some time that the Pati-Salam gauge symmetry may be broken at the scale $M \sim M_{GUT}$ by the following Higgs representations which arise naturally in the superstring construction [3],

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{H} &= (\bar{4}, 1, \bar{2}) = (u_H^c, d_H^c, \nu_H^c, e_H^c) \\ H &= (4, 1, 2) = (\bar{u}_H^c, \bar{d}_H^c, \bar{\nu}_H^c, \bar{e}_H^c)\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

The neutral components of the Higgs fields were assumed to develop VEVs

$$\langle \tilde{\nu}_H^c \rangle = \langle \tilde{\bar{\nu}}_H^c \rangle \sim M,\tag{3}$$

leading to the symmetry breaking at M :

$$G_{PS} \rightarrow SU(3)_C \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y\tag{4}$$

in the usual notation. The quarks and leptons are unified in the representations

$$F_i = (4, 2, 1)_i = \begin{pmatrix} u & u & u & \nu \\ d & d & d & e \end{pmatrix}_i$$

$$\bar{F}_i = (\bar{4}, 1, \bar{2})_i = \begin{pmatrix} u^c & u^c & u^c & \nu^c \\ d^c & d^c & d^c & e^c \end{pmatrix}_i \quad (5)$$

where the subscript i ($= 1, 2, 3$) denotes the family index. The two low energy Higgs doublets of the MSSM are contained in the following representation,

$$h = (1, 2, \bar{2}) = \begin{pmatrix} h_1^0 & h_2^+ \\ h_1^- & h_2^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

We now introduce the following superpotential

$$\begin{aligned} W = & S[\kappa(\bar{H}H - M^2) + \lambda h^2] + \lambda_6 D_6 H H + \bar{\lambda}_6 D_6 \bar{H} \bar{H} \\ & + g_{33} \bar{F}_3 F_3 h + g_{ij} \bar{F}_i F_j h \frac{(\bar{H}H)^n}{M_P^{2n}} + h_{ij} \frac{\bar{F}_i \bar{F}_j H H}{M_P} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where S denotes a G_{PS} singlet superfield, the parameters κ, λ and M are taken to be real and positive, and h^2 denotes the unique bilinear invariant $\epsilon^{ij} h_i^{(1)} h_j^{(2)}$. Also, $M_P (\simeq 2.4 \times 10^{18} \text{ GeV})$ denotes the ‘reduced’ Planck mass.

The superpotential W in Eq.7 carries two units of charge under an assumed global $U(1)_R$ symmetry, where $R_\theta = 1$ leads to an R-invariant contribution to the potential $V = \int d^2\theta W$. The R-charges of the various superfields are assigned as follows:

$$R_{D_6} = R_S = 2, \quad R_H = R_{\bar{H}} = R_h = 0, \quad R_F = R_{\bar{F}} = 1. \quad (8)$$

This $U(1)_R$ symmetry closely resembles that proposed for the MSSM by Hall and Randall [6], and contains a Z_2 subgroup which may be identified with R-parity.³ The usual problem with such global R-symmetries is that they are violated by the terms in the soft supersymmetry breaking potential, V_{soft} and in particular the gaugino masses, since the gauginos carry one unit of R-charge. Here we consider a scenario in which the superpotential in the visible sector respects the $U(1)_R$ symmetry, while

³An alternative R-symmetry in which the MSSM Higgs superfields have unit R-charges, while the matter superfields have half-integer R-charge contains a Z_2 subgroup which may be identified with ‘matter parity’ [7]. However such a choice of R-charges would allow the μ term whereas our choice of R-charges forbids it.

the hidden sector also respects the R-symmetry, but spontaneously breaks it leading to an R-violating V_{soft} .⁴

As discussed in [3] the high energy Higgs mechanism removes the $H, \bar{H}$ components $u_H^c, e_H^c, \bar{u}_H^c, \bar{e}_H^c$ from the physical spectrum (half of these states get eaten by the heavy gauge bosons and gauginos and the other half will become massive Higgs bosons), leaving massless $d_H^c, \bar{d}_H^c$. In order to give these states a large mass, following [3] we have introduced a colour sextet superfield

$$D_6 = (6, 1, 1) = (D^c, \bar{D}^c),$$

where $D^c = (\bar{3}, 1, \frac{1}{3})$ and $\bar{D}^c = (3, 1, -\frac{1}{3})$. The way the colour triplets receive super-heavy masses is the following. Remember first that the decomposition of the sextet gives an antitriplet/triplet pair ($D_6 \rightarrow D^c + \bar{D}^c$). On the other hand $\bar{H}, H$ fields contain also another such pair with the same quantum numbers: $d_H^c, \bar{d}_H^c$. To break the $SU(4) \times SU(2)_R$ the $H, \bar{H}$ fields acquire VEVs of $\mathcal{O}(M)$. Then one gets the following two mass terms

$$\langle H \rangle H D_6 + \langle \bar{H} \rangle \bar{H} D_6 \rightarrow \langle \tilde{\nu}_H \rangle \bar{d}_H^c D^c + \langle \tilde{\nu}_H^c \rangle d_H^c \bar{D}^c \quad (9)$$

so that the ‘low energy’ limit of the theory is precisely MSSM.

Note that the R-symmetry prevents the occurrence of the gauge allowed couplings $D_6 F F$, $D_6 \bar{F} \bar{F}$. This means that the Higgs colour triplet mediated (dimension five and six) baryon number violating processes are entirely eliminated. Since there is no gauge-mediated proton decay in this model, this means that the proton appears to be completely stable in the presence of our assumed $U(1)_R$. However, as noted, this symmetry must be broken in the hidden sector of the theory, which leaves open the possibility of baryon number violation arising from the hidden sector, although one would expect it to be quite suppressed relative to the dimension five terms.

⁴The would-be Goldstone boson may receive a mass from the non-perturbative sector of the hidden sector. Note that terms in the visible superpotential which are forbidden by R-symmetry, may alternatively be forbidden by suitable discrete symmetries.

As regards the fermion mass operators, following [8] we have assumed that only the third family receives a renormalisable contribution to its mass, while the other entries of the Yukawa matrix are filled out by non-renormalisable operators of the type shown, including an operator which will contribute to large Majorana masses for the right-handed neutrinos. This leads to third family Yukawa unification [9], and predictions for light quark and lepton masses and mixing angles [10]. This scheme may be enforced by introducing a further gauged $U(1)_X$ family symmetry [11], although we have not done so here.

For our present purposes, the superpotential terms of greatest interest are those involving the gauge singlet field S . Thus we shall consider the superpotential:

$$W_S = S[\kappa(\bar{H}H - M^2) + \lambda h^2] \quad (10)$$

which leads to the potential $V = V_F + V_D + V_{soft}$ where

$$V_F = |\kappa(\bar{H}H - M^2) + \lambda h^2|^2 + |\kappa S \bar{H}|^2 + |\kappa S H|^2 + |\lambda S h|^2 \quad (11)$$

$$V_{soft} = m^2(|S|^2 + |\bar{H}|^2 + |H|^2 + |h|^2) + (A_\kappa S \bar{H}H + A_\lambda S h^2 - A_1 S M^2 + H.c.) \quad (12)$$

We take the dimensionless couplings λ and κ to be real and positive, and the mass parameter M to be real and of order 10^{16} GeV. The minimal Kähler potential considered in [1] corresponds to the special choice $m = m_{3/2}$, $A_\lambda = \lambda A m_{3/2}$, $A_\kappa = \kappa A m_{3/2}$, $A_1 = \kappa(A - 2)m_{3/2}$.⁵ As in [1] we shall impose the D-flatness conditions, on the neutral components of the fields which corresponds to $|h_1^0| = |h_2^0| \equiv h$, $|\tilde{\nu}_H^c| = |\tilde{\tilde{\nu}}_H| \equiv \nu$, with all charged and coloured components set equal to zero.

Neglecting the phases, and writing $s = |S|$, the potential reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} V = & [\kappa(\nu^2 - M^2) + \lambda h^2]^2 + 2\kappa^2 s^2 \nu^2 + 2\lambda^2 s^2 h^2 \\ & + 2m^2(s^2/2 + \nu^2 + h^2) + 2A_\kappa s \nu^2 + 2A_\lambda s h^2 - 2A_1 s M^2 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

⁵For simplicity we have taken the soft masses to be all equal even in the non-minimal case, as this assumption does not qualitatively change the results.

In the absence of V_{soft} terms the potential is easily seen to be minimised by $s = 0$ with ν and h lying somewhere on a flat direction characterised by the ellipse $F_s \equiv [\kappa(\nu^2 - M^2) + \lambda h^2] = 0$. When V_{soft} terms are included, the flat direction $F_s = 0$ characterised by the ellipse will be lifted and a particular VEV for h and ν will be selected. Including the soft terms and equating $\frac{\partial V}{\partial s} = 0$ we obtain the s VEV in terms of the other VEVs

$$s = \frac{-(A_\kappa \nu^2 + A_\lambda h^2 - A_1 M^2)}{2(\kappa^2 \nu^2 + \lambda^2 h^2) + m^2} \quad (14)$$

which, for any choice of ν and h on or near the ellipse, corresponds to a small VEV of $s \sim m_{3/2}$ which will lead to “effective” μ and $B\mu$ terms of the correct order of magnitude. The condition $\frac{\partial V}{\partial \nu} = 0$ is satisfied by either $\nu = 0$ or $F_s = -(\kappa^2 s^2 + A_\kappa s + m^2)/\kappa$, while the condition $\frac{\partial V}{\partial h} = 0$ is satisfied by either $h = 0$ or $F_s = -(\lambda^2 s^2 + A_\lambda s + m^2)/\lambda$. There are thus two natural candidate minima: the “good” point with $h = 0$ and the “bad” point with $\nu = 0$. Both cases correspond to a violation of the ellipse condition $F_s = 0$ by an amount of order $m_{3/2}^2$. However this does not mean that the term $F_s^2 \sim m_{3/2}^2$ may be neglected in the analysis of the potential compared to other terms of order $m_{3/2}^2 M^2$, since as we shall see the question of the stability around each extremum is a delicate matter for this potential.

By expanding the minimisation conditions for the “good” point $h = 0$, we find that $s \approx -(A_\kappa - A_1)/(2\kappa^2) + \delta s$, $\nu^2 \approx M^2 - \delta \nu^2$ where $\delta \nu^2 = (4\kappa^2 s^2 + 2m^2 + 4A_\kappa s)/(4\kappa^2)$, and $\delta s = (-2m^2 s + 2A_1 \delta \nu^2)/(4\kappa^2 M^2)$, where the lowest order VEVs may be consistently inserted into the corrections $\delta \nu^2$, δs . The stability of the “good” case $h = 0$ is governed by the discriminant consisting of the three dimensional determinant of second derivatives. However in this case the discriminant turns out to be simply proportional to the Higgs mass

$$\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial h^2} = 4\lambda F_s + 4\lambda^2 s^2 + 4A_\lambda s + 4m^2 \quad (15)$$

Inserting the expansions for the VEVs explicitly we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial h^2} &= (\lambda^2 A_1^2 - \lambda \kappa A_1^2 - 2\lambda^2 A_\kappa A_1 + \lambda \kappa A_\kappa^2 + \lambda^2 A_\kappa^2 \\ &\quad - 2\kappa^2 A_\lambda A_\kappa + 2\kappa^2 A_\lambda A_1 + 4\kappa^4 m^2 - 2\lambda \kappa^3 m^2)/(\kappa^4) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The height of the potential at the “good” point is

$$V(h=0) = (4\kappa^2 m^2 + 2A_\kappa A_1 - A_\kappa^2 - A_1^2)M^2/(2\kappa^2) + \dots \quad (17)$$

The sign of the Higgs mass squared (whose magnitude is of order $m_{3/2}^2$ which implies that stability is a delicate matter) governs the stability of case $h=0$. For example in the minimal Kähler case we find $\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial h^2} = 2m_{3/2}^2(2(\frac{\lambda}{\kappa})^2 - 3(\frac{\lambda}{\kappa}) + 2)$ which is always positive indicating that the “good” case $h=0$ is always a local minimum. The height of the potential in this case is $V(h=0) = -\frac{m_{3/2}^4}{8\kappa^2}(8A^2 - 32A + 22)$, corresponding to a remarkable cancellation of the leading terms of order $m_{3/2}^2 M^2$ at this point. In the non-minimal case, the stability is still governed by a Higgs mass of the same order but now it may or may not correspond to a local minimum depending on choice of soft parameters, while the height of the potential is of order $m^2 M^2$.

Turning now to the “bad” point $\nu=0$ we find the corresponding results $s \approx -(A_\lambda - A_1 \frac{\lambda}{\kappa})/(2\lambda^2) + \delta s$, $h^2 \approx \frac{\kappa}{\lambda} M^2 - \delta h^2$ where $\delta h^2 = (4\lambda^2 s^2 + 2m^2 + 4A_\lambda s)/(4\lambda^2)$, and $\delta s = (-2m^2 \frac{\kappa}{\lambda} s + 2A_1 \delta h^2)/(4\kappa^2 M^2)$, where the lowest order VEVs may be consistently inserted into the corrections δh^2 , δs . The stability of the “bad” point $\nu=0$ is governed by the ν mass

$$\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \nu^2} = 4\kappa F_s + 4\kappa^2 s^2 + 4A_\kappa s + 2m^2 \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \nu^2} &= (\lambda^2 \kappa A_1^2 - \lambda^3 A_1^2 + 2\lambda^3 A_\kappa A_1 + \kappa^3 A_\lambda^2 + \lambda \kappa^2 A_\lambda^2 \\ &\quad - 2\lambda^2 \kappa A_\lambda A_\kappa - 2\lambda \kappa^2 A_\lambda A_1 + 4\lambda^4 \kappa m^2 - 2\lambda^3 \kappa^2 m^2)/(\kappa \lambda^4) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The height of the “bad” point is

$$V(\nu=0) = (4\lambda^2 \kappa^2 m^2 + 2\lambda \kappa A_1 A_\lambda - \kappa^2 A_\lambda^2 - \lambda^2 A_1^2)M^2/(2\lambda^3 \kappa) + \dots \quad (20)$$

For example in the minimal Kähler case we find $\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \nu^2} = 2m_{3/2}^2(2(\frac{\kappa}{\lambda})^2 - 3(\frac{\kappa}{\lambda}) + 2)$ which again is always positive, indicating that the “bad” point $\nu = 0$ is also always a local minimum. The height of the potential in this case is $V(\nu = 0) = -\frac{m_{3/2}^4}{8\lambda^2}(8A^2 - 32A + 22)$, again corresponding to a cancellation of leading terms.

To summarise, in the minimal case the “good” and “bad” minima are located in very deep wells corresponding to very accurate cancellation of large terms, with the wells separated by a large potential barrier of order $m_{3/2}^2 M^2$. In the non-minimal case the accurate cancellation does not take place, and the “good” and “bad” points may or may not correspond to local minima, depending on the particular values of the parameters. Several comments are in order:

- i. At tree level, and in the absence of SUSY breaking, the vacuum corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S \rangle &= 0, \quad \kappa \bar{H} H + \lambda h^2 = \kappa M^2 \\ H &= e^{i\phi} \bar{H}^*, \quad h_i^{(1)} = e^{i\theta} \epsilon_{ij} h^{(2)j*} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

- ii. After including SUSY breaking terms á la minimal supergravity (SUGRA), the S field acquires a VEV given by $\langle S \rangle = -m_{3/2}/\kappa$. This generates the MSSM parameter $\mu = \lambda \langle S \rangle = -\frac{\lambda}{\kappa} m_{3/2}$. Moreover, it turns out that [1]

$$B\mu \simeq -\frac{2\lambda}{\kappa} m_{3/2}^2 \quad (22)$$

- iii. With $\lambda \neq \kappa$, and with minimal SUGRA, there are two local minima of the potential, namely the ‘desired’ one $h = 0$, $H = \bar{H} = M(\sim M_{GUT})$, and the ‘bad’ one with $h \neq 0$, $H = \bar{H} = 0$. As we have discussed in detail, the latter can be eliminated by invoking a non-minimal Kähler potential such that only the ‘desired’ minimum survives.

- iv. With $\langle H \rangle \sim M_{GUT}$, the heaviest right-handed neutrino mass is on the order of $M_{GUT}^2/M_P \simeq 10^{13} - 10^{14}$ GeV. This follows from the last non-renormalizable

term in Eq.7. Coupled with the fact that $SU(4)$ implies the asymptotic relation $m_{\nu_\tau}^{(0)}(\text{Dirac}) = m_\tau^{(0)}$, this suggests that the ‘tau’ neutrino may, via the usual see-saw mechanism, acquire mass in the eV range. In addition it has been shown that the ‘electron’ neutrino and ‘muon’ neutrino typically have masses and mixing angles in the range suitable for the MSW solution to the solar neutrino problem, with ‘muon-tau’ neutrino mixing angles in the observable range of the CHORUS experiment [10].

v. The Z_2 subgroup of $U(1)_R$ remains unbroken and is precisely the MSSM R-parity.

Because the electroweak breaking is mediated by the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ bidoublet h , one expects that the MSSM parameter $\tan\beta \simeq m_t/m_b$. This has a number of far reaching implications. Firstly, as discussed in [9], the asymptotic relation $h_b^{(0)} = h_\tau^{(0)}$, can be exploited to ‘predict’ the top quark mass in the correct mass range, $m_t(m_t) \simeq 170$ GeV. Secondly, by taking the CP-odd scalar mass $m_A \gtrsim m_{Z^0}$, the tree level mass of the lightest (‘Weinberg-Salam’) higgs h^0 is m_{Z^0} . By including the radiative corrections, one finds that $m_{h^0} \approx 105 - 125$ GeV. Thirdly, with $\tan\beta \simeq m_t/m_b$, and depending on assumptions about the SUSY breaking parameters, one can obtain estimates of the sparticle spectrum including the LSP. For instance, with (near) universal boundary conditions on the SUSY breaking scalar and gaugino masses, one finds that the colored sparticles typically are quite heavy ($\gtrsim$ few hundred GeV), one of the staus is the lightest charged sparticle, while the LSP is primarily composed from the ‘bino’ with mass $\gtrsim 100$ GeV [12].

Finally, we note that the breaking of G_{PS} to $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{em}$ gives rise to topologically stable superheavy ($\sim 10^{17}$ GeV) monopoles that carry two quanta of Dirac magnetic charge [13]. This is consistent with the fact that the G_{PS} representations $(1, 2, 1), (1, 1, 2)$ and their conjugates carry electric charge $\pm e/2$ and are unconfined! These ‘exotics’, together with $(4, 1, 1) + (\bar{4}, 1, 1)$, carrying electric charge $\pm e/6$, be-

long to the vector-like representations of G_{PS} with masses that may be as large as M_P . Clearly, some mechanism must be found which can suppress the number density of these monopoles and their fractionally charged partners to a level below the current observational limits. One obvious mechanism would be inflation which would need to occur beneath the symmetry breaking scale M . In fact, as discussed in DLS [1], there is an in-built hybrid inflation mechanism already present in such models due to the fact that the singlet field S occurs only linearly in the superpotential, and so has a very flat potential. For S larger than some critical value the other VEVs are held at zero and false vacuum inflation may take place, as S rolls towards the origin. When S reaches some critical value, the global minimum as discussed here is quickly reached and inflation ends. Thus there may well be inflation in this model, but it may not solve the monopole problem if these are produced at the end of inflation. One possibility is that there is another period of inflation at a lower scale, as in the next-to-minimal supersymmetric model of hybrid inflation recently proposed [14], in which case the inflation at the higher scale would not seem to be required. Another possibility is that the symmetry group is taken to be not G_{PS} but $SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_R$, which does not lead to monopoles. This would lose the prediction of large $\tan \beta$.

In conclusion, we have presented a straightforward extension of the DLS scheme to the gauge group $G_{PS} \equiv SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, and thereby solved the symmetry breaking problem for this model. The proposed mechanism also solves the μ problem, and provides a mechanism for hybrid inflation. The symmetry breaking mechanism may be compared to the simple idea that the squared masses of the $H, \bar{H}$ fields are driven negative by some radiative mechanism [15]. The equivalent radiative mechanism applied here would be more indirect, and correspond to replacing the explicit mass parameter M here by the VEV of a further singlet field, with the singlet field having its mass squared driven negative by some radiative breaking mechanism, as recently discussed by Goldberg [16]. The low energy limit of this model leads to

a number of predictions which can be experimentally tested, especially at the LHC. What makes this model in particular especially worth exploring is the fact that the symmetry G_{PS} , in contrast to $SO(10)$, readily arise from superstring constructions. The experimental discovery of ‘doubly’ charged monopoles and/or charge $\pm e/2$ color singlets would perhaps be the most striking confirmation of the existence of G_{PS} symmetry in nature.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Aspen Center for Physics where this work was started. We would also like to thank G. Dvali for useful discussions. Q.S. acknowledges the DOE support under grant no.DE-FG02-91ER40626.

References

- [1] G.Dvali, G.Lazarides and Q.Shafi, hep-ph/9710314.
- [2] J. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 275.
- [3] I. Antoniadis and G. K. Leontaris, Phys. Lett. **B216** (1989) 333;
I. Antoniadis, G. K. Leontaris and J. Rizos, Phys. Lett. **B245** (1990) 161.
- [4] P. Dimopoulos, G.K. Leontaris, N.D. Tracas, Z.Phys.**C76** (1997) 327; G.K. Leontaris, Phys.Lett. **B372** (1996) 212; G.K. Leontaris, N.D. Tracas, Phys.Lett. **B372** (1996) 219; G.K. Leontaris, N.D. Tracas, Z.Phys.**C56** (1992) 479; G.K. Leontaris, N.D. Tracas, Phys.Lett.**B260** (1991) 339.
- [5] Q. Shafi and F.W . Stecker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53** (1984) 1292;
For a recent review and additional references see Q. Shafi and R.K. Schaefer, hep-ph/9612478 .

- [6] L. J. Hall and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. **B352** (1991) 289.
- [7] S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. **B112** (1982) 133.
- [8] S. F. King, Phys. Lett. **B 325**(1994) 129.
- [9] B. Ananthanarayan, G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev . **D44** (1991) 1613.
- [10] B. C. Allanach and S. F. King, Nucl.Phys.**B456** (1995) 57; *ibid* **B459**(1996)75.
- [11] B. C. Allanach, S. F. King, G. Leontaris and S. Lola, Phys. Lett. **B 407**(1997) 275; *ibid* Phys. Rev. **D 56** (1997) 2632.
- [12] See for example: B. Ananthanarayan , G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett **B300** (1993) 245.
- [13] G. Lazarides, M. Magg and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. **B97** (1980) 87.
- [14] M. Bastero-Gil and S.F.King, hep-ph/9709502.
- [15] G. Leontaris and N. Tracas, Phys. Lett. **B389** (1996) 515.
- [16] H. Goldberg, Phys. Lett. **B400** (1997) 301.